Implementation Year 3: Grade 2 Reading Specialists[1]					
Student Academic Progress					
Student Academic Progress Data	**Category**	**Point Value**	**Classroom Level Data[3]**	**Point Value**	**Point Determination**
44 Points (37% of total)[2]	Achievement	4	Percent At or Above the 4th Stanine on the Stanford 10 Reading[4]	4	4 points: ≥ 90% of students were at or above the 4th Stanine Reading 3 points: 72%-89% of students were at or above the 4th Stanine Reading 2 points: 54%-71% of students were at or above the 4th Stanine Reading 1 point: 36%-53% of students were at or above the 4th Stanine Reading 0 points: <36% of students were at or above the 4th Stanine Reading
	Growth	36	SLO Growth Statement(s)	12	12 points: ≥ 90% of the students met the SLO 9 points: 80%-89% of the students met the SLO 6 points: 60%-79% of the students met the SLO 3 points: <60% of the students met the SLO
			SLO Growth Statement(s)	12	12 points: ≥ 90% of the students met the SLO 9 points: 80%-89% of the students met the SLO 6 points: 60%-79% of the students met the SLO 3 points: <60% of the students met the SLO
			DIBELS[5]: Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) Growth- Compare beginning of year to end of year	12	12 points: ≥0. 8 9 points: 0.65-0.79 6 points: 0.5-0.64 3 points 0.2-0.49 2 points: 0.05-0.19 0 points: <0.05
	College and Career Ready	4	Grade 3 Level Reduction in FFB Reading (School level data from prior two years)	2	2 points: Reduced Grade 3 Reading FFB by ≥ 2% 1 point: Reduced Grade 3 Reading FFB by ≥ 1% 0 points: Reduced Grade 3 Reading FFB by < 1%
			Attendance Rate (School Level)	2	2 points: Attendance rate ≥95% 1 point: Attendance rate between 75-94% 0 points: Attendance rate <75%

Data Table ID: 2001.1 (Version 11.0)

Teaching Performance					
Teaching Performance	**Domain**	**Point Value**	**Leadership Standards**	**Point Value**	**Point Determination**
66 Points (55% of total)	Planning and preparation	18	1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	3	3 points: Distinguished 2 points: Proficient 1 point: Basic 0 points: Unsatisfactory
			1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	3	
			1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	3	
			1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	3	
			1e. Designing Coherent Instruction	3	
			1f. Designing Student Assessments	3	
	The Classroom Environment	15	2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	3	
			2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	3	
			2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	3	
			2d. Managing Student Behavior	3	
			2e. Organizing Physical Space	3	
	Instruction	15	3a. Communicating With Students	3	
			3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	3	
			3c. Engaging Students in Learning	3	
			3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	3	
			3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	3	
	Professional Responsibilities	18	4a. Reflecting on Teaching	3	
			4b. Maintaining Accurate Records	3	
			4c. Communicating With Families	3	
			4d. Participating in a Professional Community	3	
			4e. Growing and Developing Professionally	3	
			4f. Showing Professionalism	3	

Data Table ID: 2001.1 (Version 11.0)

Surveys					
Survey	**Category**	**Point Value**	**Survey Source**	**Point Value**	**Point Determination**
10 Points (8% of total)	Survey	10	Parent Survey (School level)	5	5 points: ≥78% of the parent survey mean scores were a 3 or above 3 points: 41%-77% of parent survey mean scores were a 3 or above 0 points: <41% of parent survey mean scores were a 3 or above
			Self-Review	1	1 point: Teacher completed self-review 0 points: Teacher did not complete self-review
			Peer Review	4	4 points: the average of the peer review mean scores was a 3 or above 2 points: the average of the peer review mean scores was 2-2.99 0 points: the average of the peer review mean scores was < 2

Summative Score of the Three Components	
Point Value	**Point Determination**
120	120-108 points: Highly Effective 107-85 points: Effective 84-60 points: Developing <60 points: Ineffective
2	Bonus Points[6]

Note: 1. The information being provided in the rating table is part of a teacher evaluation system and has not yet been validated. ADE recommends that LEAs do not wholly rely on the information provided in these tables when designating summative teacher classifications as part of the evaluation process, without piloting the rating system first.

2. The weighting on school/classroom-level data is greater for Grade 2 teachers because the student survey is not part of their evaluation.

3. Data are aggregated for each teacher. If a teacher has multiple classrooms or grades, data from those classrooms are combined for the aggregation.

4. The grade 2 new teachers who choose to use this rating table will use prior year grade level Stanford 10 data.

5. Growth Points Calculation for DIBELS: [(Sum of points)/N)]*100%. Points: 1pt= students who remain at benchmark, intensive to strategic, and strategic to benchmark; 2pts= intensive to benchmark; -1pt=benchmark to strategic or strategic to intensive; -2pts= benchmark to intensive; 0pts= for remaining at intensive or strategic.

6. In order to encourage more inclusive and collaborative practices within general education settings, special education and general education teachers who collaborate to close the achievement gap between the students with IEPs and general education students will receive 2 bonus points in the final calculation

Data Table ID: 2001.1 (Version 11.0)